



**Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (ICJIS)
Charge Standardization Project – Phase 1 (CSP1)**

***An Examination of Instruments: Capias and Show Cause*
(Internal Study, **Draft Date: March 8, 2002**)**

Abstract

There are central questions this research intends to address, which are synopsized and summarized into major themes with additional explanation, later in this paper. Essentially, an examination of documents was conducted in context with associated statutes associated with issuance of each document, and each document's primary uses by the courts and interpretation by the criminal justice community in general.

Q: Should a *Criminal Show Cause summons* or *Rule to Show Cause* receive an Offense Tracking Number (OTN)?

A: No. The objective of these instruments is typically as an instrument of notice, and secondarily, to induce compliance. This is especially true in the district courts. The show cause, regardless of which court issued it, is considered to be an instrument of notice that requires signature to execute (Schliessmann). Although the document face provides an area to record (new) charges, this document is infrequently, if ever, used for that purpose.

Q: Should a *Capias* or *Capias to Show Cause* receive an OTN?

A: Yes. The objective in issuing a capias is also for a person to come before a court to show cause, and is accomplished through arrest. However, a capias can also be used to revoke bail/bond and incarcerate until a later hearing, or to allege a new offense that originated from a previously adjudicated matter (such as contempt of court, failure to appear, or failure to obey a court order). The instrument is used traditionally while a person is on bond and awaiting adjudication (and violates the conditions of bond). A capias may also be used to inflict more punitive measures for recognized non-compliance measures which do not qualify as CCRE reportable by statute.

The layout of both documents used by the district courts is almost identical (criminal show cause summons and capias); but one difference lies in the detainer ability of the capias, which a show cause summons does not have. A capias is a more punitive approach, and often the approach of last resort (Conway, Milbourne). Also, each with each instrument, the court must indicate whether a CCRE report is made to VSP. Some offenses require mandatory reporting once a person is arrested, charged and/or adjudicated.

Q: If a *capias* should receive an OTN to enable tracking, how should a *capias* be classed in terms of reportable offenses (i.e., what charge(s) can or would be associated to the *capias* by an OTN)?

A: Failure to Appear, Contempt of Court, and Failure to Obey a Court Order. Contempt of Court offenses are not classified offenses (Milbourne, Code of Virginia), and should show correlated statutes to which the charge applies. The level of the seriousness (misdemeanor or felony) for Failure to Appear offenses will be predicated by the underlying charge on which the *capias* was issued (instant offense). Failure to Obey a Court Order appears to be a misdemeanor in most instances (Milbourne).

Additionally, while the circuit court may use a *capias* to show cause or merely issue a *capias* to revoke bond or inflict a sanction, these actions are not always CCRE reportable (Lauch). At times, the court may be required to specifically indicate whether the reason for issuing meets CCRE reportable offense activity; an example of this would be issuance specifically for Contempt of Court and Failure to Appear which was brought about by an unanswered Rule to Show Cause. In this scenario, the defendant was adjudicated on a felony matter, with some suspended incarceration time, and perhaps probation. The defendant is reported to have been non-compliant on a requirement as listed in the sentencing order, so the court issues a Rule to Show Cause, notifying the defendant of a hearing date to answer for alleged non-compliance. The defendant fails to appear on the indicated court date. At this juncture it is within a judge's discretion to issue a *capias* with reportable CCRE offense statutes, or simply issue the *capias* so that the sheriff can serve and detain the defendant for a preliminary hearing.

Q: If OTNs are assigned to *capiases*, what impact will this have on the Uniform Statute Tables (UST) maintained through ICJIS with regard to booking of an individual once a *capias* is served, and criminal history reporting?

A: One reason an OTN should be assigned to a *capias* because it is an actual arrest, with a bond determination made by a magistrate. As there are charge statutes which may be cited on the instrument additionally and independent from the previously adjudicated matter (the instant or "original" offense), this could be an indication that assigning an OTN would be appropriate. Again, new charges arising from previous matters are more likely to be charged on a *capias* as opposed to a show cause summons.

This does, however, uncover a potential problem: the classification of Contempt of Court offense within the UST. Contempt is not specifically classified in the Code, although it does carry a standard punishment structure in all instances (generally \$250 fine and/or ten days in jail). Different forms of contempt must be charged by specific statute, and there is no graduating offense level or severity, as with other offenses.

Input from VSP would help clarify how charges and convictions are classified for criminal history reporting and therefore, UST classification. All arrests are

fingerprinted and reported to the VSP for inclusion in databases on the VCIN system, but not all capias arrests may be offenses are mandatory reporting to CCRE.

Additionally, a capias can be used against a defendant in both courts, but there is also an indication that there are only specific statutes that may apply, when new charges are cited. A capias is not the same as a blanket warrant, and therefore, particular contempt offenses must be noted for use in the UST tables. There will need to be a specific section that connotes the statutes that indicate contempt, failure to appear, and failure to obey a court order, as well, depending on the offense level of the underlying offense.

Alternately, not all capias issuances are reportable to the VSP for input into CCRE. In such instances, and because the court does have discretion when it comes to the reason for issuance, a straining method may need to be employed in a theoretical model. A straining mechanism could be employed only to recognize those capias which are either deemed CCRE reportable, or for which a separate and independent statute has been cited that is unrelated to the revocation of the underlying charge.

With regard to the Supreme Court of Virginia's (SCV) Circuit Court Criminal Division entity relationship diagram (ERD), each order is tracked and numbered, but the Rule to Show Cause is separated both by documentation and records keeping; SCV notes a capias table which includes all capias, whether CCRE reportable or not. This should be another indicator as to the differences between the documents.

Document Analysis

A synopsis of relevant instruments used by the courts is as follows:

District Courts	Circuit Court
Summons (Form DC-319)	Rule to Show Cause (Form CC-1355)
Show Cause Summons, Bond Forfeiture – Civil (Form DC-482)	Capias to Show Cause (Form CC-1356) [contains CCRE option]
Show Cause Summons, Criminal (Form DC-360X) [contains CCRE option]	
Capias (Form DC-361X PC) [contains CCRE option]	

Data elements on the district court's documents are very similar in nature. There are elements on the capias which slightly differ from the criminal show cause summons, most notably the warning appearing on the summons regarding

penalties for failure to appear. However, most of the elements are almost identical on each document.

Layout is simple and the data elements on the circuit court's forms are sparse. What it does contain is very simplified information and orders for appearance, thus lacking richness in elements for comparison.

Felony cases first handled by the district courts through a probable cause hearing for certification to the circuit court for trial may also be serviced by the criminal show cause summons and/or the *capias*. Both instruments are very similar in terms of data elements and overall layout, and both are intended to "notify and induce" a person to appear for a reinstatement or revocation hearing, or other motion. If there is an additional charge in addition to the revocation, however, this will normally appear on a *capias* and not on a summons (Milbourne, General District Court Manual).

Bench Warrants

A "bench warrant" may be a *capias* or warrant which is signed by a judge/prepared at judge's request while presiding over a case and court is in session. Requires arrest and detention of defendant. The terminology is from an older, blanket usage of arrest instruments sworn out during the course of a hearing (Milbourne).

Framing the Research

Capias and Capias to Show Cause

The Code of Virginia gives no technical definition of the instrument, only its uses. This writ is defined by the Supreme Court of Virginia as "a type of arrest document issued by the court charging the offender with a violation of a court order or court process of contempt of court" (District Court Manual:A-3). It should be noted that the *capias* may be used to collect a person for sentencing, reinstatement, or revocation, and detain them for further matters for the court (*West's Black's Law*).

A *capias* may be issued by a magistrate, judge or the Clerk of Court, just as a warrant or show cause summons may be issued. The complainant is very often the court itself (judge) or an officer of the court, such as a pretrial or probation officer. Virginia statutes VA §19.2-123, VA §19.2-152.4:1, and VA §19.2-303.3 provide supervision officers with a vehicle to seek a *capias* against a probationer for a variety of reasons; the officer may obtain a *capias* directly from the presiding judge or magistrate, or route the request through the Commonwealth's Attorney in the form of a violation notice. A *capias* may serve as show cause notification and simultaneously be a charging document for Failure to Appear, Contempt of Court, or Failure to Obey a Court Order.

A *capias* is limited in scope as an instrument of arrest. There are very specific allegations or charges for which the *capias* can be drawn, as indicated on the face

of Form DC-361X (Capias), and listing on the face of the form: Failure to Appear, and Contempt of Court and Failure to Obey a Court Order.

In the district court, the preparer has statutory choices to indicate on the form. Failure to Appear is statutorily punished via VA §19.2-128. Contempt of court is addressed through VA §16.1-69.24, 18.2-456, and VA §18.2-458.

A capias to show cause (Form CC-1356) is an order to prepare a capias in response to felony-level, previously adjudicated matters. In a circuit court, a serious or violent felony could necessitate issuance of capias (and therefore, arrest) if there is non-compliance on the part of the defendant, while appealed misdemeanor crimes and less serious felonies will usually result in issuance of a Rule to Show Cause (summons notice) as a first-line form of remedy (Pogue).

The Capias to Show Cause motion issued in circuit courts is normally prepared and signed by the Clerk of Court. After a capias has been prepared by the court, it is then forwarded to the sheriff for process service.

In circuit courts, the difference between a Rule to Show Cause and Capias to Show Cause may seem less distinct. In the circuit court venue, the clerk completes Form CC-1356, which facilitates issuance of a capias. One defining difference, however, is that a Rule to Show Cause can never carry a CCRE reportable order, while a Capias to Show Cause can.

District courts and circuit courts have discretion when issuing these documents. Both may indicate whether the person is to be “remanded” for CCRE reporting, meaning that the court’s issuance of capias (arrest and any additional charges for which the court used the capias as process service) is to be reported to the VSP.

Both courts may use the writ as process to notify and detain an individual simultaneously, but the court also has other issuance options such as issuing a capias to revoke bail, sanction a defendant in some manner by reviewing the original sentence and modifying and/or re-imposing it, or by intimating a new offense is alleged to have occurred. In that instant, only Failure to Appear, Contempt of Court, of Failure to Obey a Court Order (includes all statutory variations) may be used. It may also simultaneously be used as an expedient method to induce appearance for a Show Cause Summons/Rule to Show Cause for which the court received no response.

If the matter originated as a civil matter and the defendant in a suit is not compliant, the judge also has the option of arresting via capias and jailing the individual until compliance is demonstrated. The most common example is when a judge temporarily jails an uncooperative former spouse until child support arrearage has been brought current. There is no criminal violation reported here, and this is known as “purging the contempt,” meaning that defendant has the power to ameliorate the situation by simple compliance (by paying the overdue child support, in this example). The respondent can be freed and released immediately, upon satisfying any monetary obligation, for example. This is known as “purging” a

show cause for contempt. The objective here is to collect fines, payments or induce compliance, as the preferred remedy.

As provided by VA §8.01-293, the sheriff of a locality is normally designated to serve process for capias issuance. A law enforcement officer (police) may also execute a writ on behalf of the court, but normally only serves a show cause document.

When a person is arrested via capias, it may be for a separate and distinct matter, albeit stemming from an instant offense. Upon arrest via capias, magistrates conduct bail hearings on a capias, and defendants are fingerprinted and booked on capiases as though it were a new charge. Capiases may be issued for a myriad of reasons as listed in the statutes, and the appropriate penalties imposed by the court are for the specific violations (Harris). This may also indicate that the arrest will automatically be reported to the VSP by the booking facility.

Additionally, it should be noted that when a defendant is arrested via capias for any reason and is either held without bond by the magistrate or does not make bond by the morning of the next business day, a pretrial services officer must perform an interview and conduct an investigation. The defendant, whether making bail earlier or appearing the next day, must then make an appearance before the court for a pretrial hearing, wherein the judge reads the charge(s) or matter(s) for disposal on the instrument to the defendant, records the legal representation the defendant intends (retained, appointed, or waived) and sets the court date. The judge will, at that time, then require the investigation report from the pretrial services officer, which will also contain a bond recommendation. The judge will then make a determination on the bond and release.

This procedure mirrors arrest via warrant. While the caveat must be added that procedures may vary slightly from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, especially with regard to the availability of pretrial services investigations, this is the standard process.

With regard to records input and maintained by the VSP in the Wanted Persons section of VCIN, both capiases and warrants are input into the Wanted Persons database as soon as VSP receives notice of issuance. The charge(s) is then cleared from the database when a person is arrested (at time of service). The distinction is made via charge (statute violation), and in the case of a capias, the underlying charge and any new charge will both be reflected in Wanted Persons.

In the Wanted Persons system, charging document type (capias, warrant) is noted in the Miscellaneous field section, and is of secondary consequence. A capias is considered both charging and arresting document. The important identifying criterion is by statute violation, and not so much by writ type. Show cause summons never appear in VCIN databases as they hold no arrest or charge power (Kemmler).

With regard to court date, it has been observed that matters to be handled via *capias* may either be “rolled together” and adjudicated with the instant offense, or may receive an independent court date for adjudication.

In some instances, during any revocation or adjudication hearing, the burden of proof for any alleged non-compliance lies with the respondent to reasonably show the court proof of compliance. The respondent may also be fined or jailed, until the obligation has been satisfied.

New offenses stemming from a previous matter may be charged using the *capias* as a charging document. The three most frequently charged offenses are as follows:

1. Failure to Appear (FTA)
2. Contempt of Court (COC)
3. Failure to Obey a Court Order (may also be charged as COC)

Failure to Appear (FTA)

Only a judge will charge a defendant with Failure to Appear. Generally, the court itself issues the *capias* instrument. While magistrates may issue a *capias*, they are only rarely requested to do so.

When issued for FTA, much will depend on the category of the underlying offense; if the underlying matter was misdemeanor level, the charge appearing on the *capias* instrument will be adjudicated as a misdemeanor. If adjudicated guilty, statutes provide a penalty structure for FTA as a Class 1 misdemeanor. This charge can be served through a *capias*, and adjudicated from that document. Criminal history would capture this as a conviction for misdemeanor or felony Failure to Appear.

Accordingly, if the underlying offense is a felony, then a felony FTA charge will be issued. For example, charges which have been certified for trial in the Circuit court or misdemeanors which have been appealed to the Circuit Court will incur a felony FTA charge appropriate to be served through a *capias*. If adjudicated guilty, statutes provide a penalty structure for FTA as a Class 6 felony. Also, if a defendant is charged and adjudicated guilty on two previous charges of misdemeanor FTA, a third misdemeanor charge of FTA may incur adjudication in felony status.

Contempt of Court (COC)

There are two types of contempt for which a person may be charged, both in civil and criminal cases.

“Direct contempt is committed in the court’s presence or near enough thereto as to interfere with the administration of justice. Because direct contempt is committed in the presence of the court, the court may punish the offender based on its own knowledge of the facts without further notice to the contemnor.” (Circuit Court Manual:5-34)

"Indirect contempt is committed outside the presence of the court and proof of the act is required. An example of indirect contempt is the failure of a witness to appear after being personally served with a subpoena." (Circuit Court Manual:5-34)

Below lists types of contempt, and how the court interprets what is appropriate in different situations:

1. Civil contempt – does not require proof beyond reasonable doubt for a finding of culpability.
2. Criminal contempt – requires proof beyond reasonable doubt for finding of guilt.

Generally, contempt offenses will be charged directly only by a judge, but a Commonwealth's attorney may also secure a *capias* through the court because of a violation (bond, supervision, or sentencing) or allege indirect contempt. However, pretrial and probation officers may also secure a *capias* through a magistrate for documented failure to comply with supervision conditions (Emmons, Code of Virginia).

It is notable, however, that "Contempt of Court" is not a classified offense, meaning that it constitutes neither a misdemeanor nor a felony. When a person is cited for Contempt, the act must be in violation of a specific statute. Contempt of Court citations are usually always generated because of an instant offense, and may be adjudicated immediately or at a subsequent hearing. (SCV CC Manual:5-32, Milbourne). As previously discussed, contempt is defined within very specific contexts by statute. The highest penalty that can be levied against a defendant for Contempt is a \$250.00 in district court and \$50 in circuit court (if without a jury), fine, court costs, and/or ten days in jail. If a jury has been impaneled in a criminal or civil case in a circuit court, the penalty structure broadens considerably and is without statutory limitation (Circuit Court Manual:5-33).

Distinctions in contempt ultimately predicate whether the instrument used to execute the charge and record the adjudication will require a CCRE report from the SCV to the VSP. Accordingly, indirect contempt can also be charged as Failure to Obey a Court Order. While the circuit court initially will use a Rule to Show Cause to notify the offender of alleged indirect attempt, a *capias* is also used, especially if the matter is considered serious or there is any danger to the community. It must be clear that a defendant committed Contempt of Court versus committing another statutory crime outright.

The court may consider incidents such as a defendant's failure to appear on a previous summons or criminal show cause summons, has alleged to have been non-compliant with supervision or other court/magistrate's order, accrued a new charge and thereby violated bond and/or supervision conditions as grounds to charge a person with contempt.

Alternately, if a respondent fails to demonstrate compliance with a court order or other court instructions, this may be construed by the judge as contempt of court in

the form of willfully disobeying a court order (indirect contempt of court). Additionally, if the respondent's behavior before the judge or anywhere in the court on the court date is unacceptable, there may additional findings of Contempt of Court (direct contempt of court, VA §18.2-456).

Failure to Obey a Court Order

In this situation, the objective is now to punish the respondent for failure to obey a court order and/or for subsequent behavior while in the presence of the court. This cannot be purged by payment and is now becomes a criminal charge, usually Contempt of Court.

Show Cause Summons and Rule to Show Cause

The Code of Virginia gives no technical definition of the instrument, only its uses. The Rule to Show Cause is defined by the Supreme Court of Virginia as "A court ruling directing the recipient to appear and present to the court such reasons and considerations as one has to offer why the recipient should be punished for violating a court order or legal process or for contempt of court" (District Court Manual: A-10). As described by West's Black's Law, the show cause order is a "...court order, decree execution, etc., to appear as directed, and present to the court such reasons and considerations as one has to offer why a particular order, decree, etc., should not be confirmed, take effect, be executed, or as they case may be. An order to a person or corporation, on motion of opposing party, to appear in court and explain why the court should not take a proposed action. If the person or corporation fails to appear or to give sufficient reasons why the court should take no action, the court will take action." This connotes the conveyance of legal problems to a person or defendant, and constitutes an obligation for said person or defendant to appear before the court at the court's direction and show cause why the court should not take any action against the defendant.

Under that definition, the show cause summons is an instrument of notice, and is not a charging instrument. Even though a judge may, after the service of a show cause summons and disposal of the immediate matter, find contempt, the notice may reflect new information when the defendant is before the judge, but this is not considered to be the charging writ. As such, there is no adjudication for allegations of "contempt" on a summons itself, as this may be determined only after an appearance is made, and the summons is only a vehicle to notify of an appearance (Schliessmann, Lauch, Milbourne). A Criminal Show Cause Summons is commonly regarded as an instrument of notice (Schliessmann), and its purpose is specifically to notify and request that a respondent appear before the court to answer questions stemming from a previous matter that has been already disposed.

A Criminal Show Cause Summons (district courts) may be issued (or signed) either by a judge, clerk, or magistrate. A Rule to Show Cause (circuit court) is issued by the clerk at the judge's direction or if there appears to be sufficient evidence presented by some other complaining party's affidavit (most notably, the

Commonwealth's Attorney in criminal matters) alleging non-compliant behavior or other matters.

A show cause can be served either by a police officer, or, under certain circumstances, can be sent by certified and/or registered mail to a respondent's last known address (it is always the respondent's responsibility to notify the court of any changes of address). Both are considered "service."

In either case, the summons requires a signature, which is also the respondent's promise to appear before the court at the indicated time and date. If the summons is served by a police officer, the officer does not have the option to take the respondent into custody after serving the summons, unless there are extenuating circumstances (this is consistent with service of Virginia Uniform Summonses). The respondent's signature as promise to appear is normally acceptable and after the respondent has been served, remains free and is expected to appear before the court as promised. This is true for both criminal and civil cases for show cause summons service.

Both the court summons (Form DC-482) and the criminal show cause summons is similar in appearance, data elements, and instructions. The difference lies in the intended usage; the show cause summons is notice on an pre-existing case, whereas a court summons is for a new (misdemeanor) matter.

In both district and circuit court civil cases, a show cause can be issued if it is believed the respondent has not complied with a court order, followed the court's instructions, or made an action against a plaintiff which the court deems a violation of the terms of agreement or remedy which the court sanctioned, or has in some way been noncompliant. The plaintiff in a civil case must initiate this process with the court in that instance, and file an affidavit with the Clerk of Court alleging non-compliance on the part of the respondent.

In both district and circuit court criminal cases, the complaining witness may approach either the judge or Commonwealth's attorney and allege either that the defendant has violated terms of supervision, a court or magistrate's order, and has been non-compliant with bail or sentencing terms in some manner. A judge, clerk, or magistrate can authorize the criminal show cause summons, and in the circuit court, the Clerk issues the capias to show cause order.

In civil cases, when a respondent does not comply with the court's instructions, it is up to the injured party in a civil litigation to bring this to the court's attention. An affidavit is submitted to the Clerk of Court, and a show cause summons is issued. The respondent will then be required to appear before the court on the appointed time and date as indicated on the summons.

A court summons and a show cause summons are used in both civil and criminal cases within the circuit court, depending on certain circumstances. When issued, the court is requesting the respondent to appear before the court, and show cause (explain):

- 1) Why the court should not revoke a suspended sentence and re-impose it upon the offender (sentencing or fine) (criminal case); and/or
- 2) Respondent to answer why the courts' order was not followed, completed, or why the respondent was not compliant (court order, or fine) (civil case).

More specifically, the show cause summons may be issued in the follow instances:

- 1) Criminal cases. Revocation of suspended incarceration time for previously sentenced offenders.

Examples:

- a) Ordered to obey a court order of any kind or risk revocation;
- b) Offender ordered into supervised probation as alternative sentencing, with suspended incarceration time permanently removed if probation period is successfully completed.

Example: Attend anger management as part of supervised probation.

- 2) Civil cases. A court order instructing a respondent to be compliant with a court order and follow its instructions. May include payment of fines or debts.

Example: court order instructing one parent to provide support to the other parent of a child in common.

Additionally, a person is neither tried nor sentenced through a show cause summons. Because a show cause is issued, the implication here is that there is an already-existing case before the court, either civil or criminal, and there has been alleged non-compliance on the part of the respondent, for which the court seeks further information.

Conclusions

As previously documented, a civil matter may progress into a criminal matter due to non-compliance and other actions the court deems a violation of an order or a disregard for the court's power over a matter. Therefore, any capias issued which contains a reportable offense and new charge from either a criminal or civil matter will need to be captured and assigned an OTN.

While both documents have similar data elements and may serve as instruments of notice, all indications are that the capias rather than the show cause is the bearer of new charges related to an instant offense when it is necessary, and is a more widely used sanction tool. Accordingly, re-evaluation of the data elements on all the Capias and Show Cause documents to clarify use, intent, and outcome might prove useful for a number of issues, chiefly to capture new charges and alleviate confusion which contributes to erroneous or incomplete data entry at booking agencies.

The capias should be targeted for OTNs because arrests are automatically reported for Incident Based Reporting (IBR) and Uniform Crime Reports (UCR), and a capias appears to be the document of choice when the court must use a writ to allege an offense on an existing matter in cases under supervision and awaiting trial, and previously adjudicated matters, such as revocations.

One of the major problems that OTNs could alleviate with regard to the use of the capias as a charging vehicle would be to provide clarification for jail and booking officers. Presently, it is not always clear when new charges are initiated and notice is served through the vehicle of the capias. Booking and jail officers could be provided with better clarification to quickly distinguish between underlying charge(s) for which the capias is used as a show cause notice or other sanction tool, and a charging document bearing a new charge (such as FTA, COC, or Failure to Obey a Court Order) which relates to the underlying or instant offense. With an OTN in place, it would be easier for booking officers to distinguish between capiases which most definitely should be booked as new charges, from those for which arrests must be reported, but are either a revocation or other sanction which do not qualify as a new charge.

Bibliography

Interview Resources

Conway, Janice. Circuit Court Technical Assistant, Supreme Court of Virginia. February 4, 2002. Telephone interview and written responses to prepared questions.

Emmons, Michael L. Senior Pretrial Services Officer, Chesterfield County. February 14, 2002. Telephone interview and written responses to prepared questions.

Harris, Rosemary R. Chief Magistrate, City of Richmond (District 13). February 7, 2002. Written response to prepared questions.

Kemmler, Robert. Lieutenant, Virginia State Police. May 13, 2002. In-person response to prepared questions.

Lauch, Constance. Court Operations Administrator, Chesterfield Circuit Court (District 12). February 15, 2002. Telephone interview in response to prepared questions.

Milbourne, B. Bryan. Chief Judge, Accomac Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court (District 2A). February 7, 2002. Telephone interview in response to prepared questions.

Pogue, Michael. Circuit Court Analyst, Supreme Court of Virginia. January 30, 2002. Written responses to prepared question materials.

Schliessmann, James E. Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General (Virginia). February 15, 2002. Telephone interview in response to prepared questions.

von Unwerth, Catherine. Systems Analyst, Supreme Court of Virginia. January 29, 2002. Written responses to prepared question materials.

Publications

1949- Commonwealth of Virginia; Virginia Code Commission; Michie Company. Code of Virginia, 1950. Charlottesville, VA: Michie Co. [1949-].

1999. Bryan A. Garner; (Editor) Henry Campbell Black (Editor). West's Black's Law Dictionary. 7th edition, West Group: August 1999.

2001. Supreme Court of Virginia. Circuit Court Manual, Twenty-Fifth Edition. Richmond, Virginia: July 2001.

2001. Supreme Court of Virginia. District Court Manual, Twenty-Fifth Edition. Richmond, Virginia: July 2001.

2001. Supreme Court of Virginia. Magistrate Manual. Richmond, Virginia: July 2001.

Other Proprietary Documentation

2001. Supreme Court of Virginia. Entity Relationship Diagram and Criminal Division data element documentation. Release date: February 15, 2001.

Appendices

Appendix - Part A

Glossary

Court order - A command or mandatory direction of a judge that is made during a case. Also includes a command of the judge that establishes courtroom or administrative procedures (SCV District Court Manual).

Instant offense, original offense, underlying offense – Offense served by warrant, petition, or summons. After adjudication, is the basis for dispositional hearings such as sentencing, and other hearings and reviews, such as reinstatement of cases or revocations. Pre-adjudication, while a defendant awaits trial, may be serviced by a capias or show cause. Post-adjudication, may be serviced by capias or show cause with regard to sentencing or remedy in a civil suit.

Reinstatement – Matters before the court which remain open and inactive, or which are disposed but which may be reopened at any time. This would include cases that the court classifies as open, deferred, and *Nolle prosequi*. Matters in these categories can be reinstated as criminal or civil matters before the court, and the existing case may become active again and move forward with regard to legal processes.

Revocation - The recall of some power, authority, or thing granted or a destroying or making void of some deed that had existed until the act of revocation made it void (SCV Magistrate Manual).

Appendice - Part B

Source Material: Code of Virginia, 1950

Capias: §8.01-293, §19.2-123, §19.2-149, §19.2-152.4:1, §19.2-219, §19.2-232, §19.2-234, §19.2-303.3, §19.2-390, §19.2-76, §20-87.

Show Cause: §16.1-292, §19.2-11.

Contempt of Court: §16.1-69.24, §18.2-456, §18.2-458, §19.2-123, §20-66.

Failure to Appear: §19.2-128, §19.2-258, §19.2-390, §19.2-73.1, §19.2-76, §19.2-76.3.